

DONALD BROGSDALE, III,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 WALMART, et al.,)
)
 Defendants.)

On October 19, 2017, Magistrate Judge Numbers issued a Memorandum and Recommendation (“M&R”) [D.E. 9] and recommended that the court dismiss Donald Brogsdale, III’s (“Brogsdale”) 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint without prejudice. Judge Numbers concluded that Brogsdale failed to provide to a short and plain statement of his claims, and failed to connect any named defendant to any alleged constitutional violation. Alternatively, Judge Numbers concluded that the court should abstain under *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971), and its progeny. No party objected to the M&R.

“The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge’s report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (emphasis, alteration, and quotation omitted); see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Absent a timely objection, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation omitted). The court has reviewed the M&R and the record. The court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. Accordingly, the court adopts the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 9].

In sum, the court adopts the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 9], and Brogsdale's complaint is
DISMISSED without prejudice. The clerk shall close the case.

SO ORDERED. This 21 day of December 2017.

J. C. Dever
JAMES C. DEVER III
Chief United States District Judge